LINK:

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

## CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

| Case No.  | CV 13-09250 BRO (MRWx)  |   |   | Date  | June 6, 2014  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| Title   | ANGELIA M. HILL v. DEBORAH LEE JAMES, SECRETARY U.S. AIR FORCE                                      |   |   |   |   |  |  |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |  |  |
| Present: The  | e Honorable   | BEVERLY REID O'CONNELL, United States District Judge  |   |   |   |  |  |
| Renee A. Fisher   |   | Not Present   |   |   | N/A   |  |  |
| Deputy Clerk  |   | Court Reporter  |   |   | Tape No.  |  |  |
| Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:   |   |   | Attorneys Present for Defendants:   |   |   |  |  |
| Not Present   |   | nt  | Not Present   |   |   |  |  |
| <b>Proceedings:</b> (IN CHAMBERS)   |   |   |   |   |   |  |  |
| ORDER TO SHOW CASE RE FAILURE TO OPPOSE   |   |   |   |   |   |  |  |
| (Dkt. No. 2014. (Se least 21 da Plaintiff's of today, I failure to to C.D. Cal. | 49.) When E e id.) Pursua ays prior to the opposition to Plaintiff has file an opposite. L.R. 7-12. | Defendant filed on to the Court'ne scheduled here Defendant's no illed no opposition "may be defended by the court of the | the motion, she says Local Rule 7-9 aring date. C.D. notion was due notion. Pursuant to be eemed consent to | set the hear 0, a party m Cal. L.R. 7 o later than the Court's o the granti | s's motion to dismiss. ing date for June 23, nust oppose a motion at 7-9. Accordingly, n June 2, 2014. Yet as s Local Rule 7-12, ng of the motion." |  |  |

Accordingly, Plaintiff is ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE why Defendant's motion should not be granted. Plaintiff's response to this order to show cause must be filed **no later than Tuesday, June 10, 2014, at noon.** An appropriate response to this order will include reasons demonstrating good cause for Plaintiff's failure to file an opposition to Defendant's motion. The Court admonishes Plaintiff that this is the second time she has failed to file a timely opposition to Defendant's motions. (*See* Dkt. No. 39.) Continued failure to participate in this lawsuit will be deemed a failure to prosecute, and the case will be dismissed. *Chambers v. NASCO Inc.*, 501 U.S. 32, 44 (1991).

## IT IS SO ORDERED.

|                      | :  |
|----------------------|----|
| Initials of Preparer | rf |
| ·                    |    |